

Types of Written Corrective Feedback: Overview of Teachers' Implementation in Indonesia

¹Nirma Paris, ²Sutida Ngonkum, ³Rezkiawati Nazaruddin

^{1,2}Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen - Thailand

³Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, West Sulawesi University, Majene - Indonesia

E-mail: ¹nirma.paris@gmail.com, ²nsutid@kku.ac.th, ³keenadin@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present article aims to provide an overview of the written corrective feedback types. It also presents the review of previous studies on the written corrective feedback as well as its effectiveness, especially in Indonesian setting. Written corrective feedback has been provided by the teachers to help the students to improve their L2 writing for decades. The teacher provides the feedback in many ways which include crossing out the errors with or without providing the correct form, targeting the grammatical errors, providing grammatical description of an error, and so on. However, not all of types of corrective feedback offer the same effectiveness. There has been a claim that direct corrective feedback enhances the students' writing accuracy, focused corrective feedback helps the students to acquire grammatical rules of targeted linguistic features, and metalinguistic corrective feedback assists the students to be aware of their errors in which turn to help them in revising their writing. Hence, this paper argues that the combination of direct, focused, metalinguistic corrective feedback can best benefit students' learning. The paper further suggests that the teacher provides the appropriate feedback for the students. Appropriate combination of feedbacks is particularly suggested in this paper.

Keywords: Effectiveness, L2 writing, the teacher's feedback, written corrective feedback.

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is the process of thinking to create the idea, express it through the sentences into paragraph, organize the idea and revise it to make a good writing [1,2]. Writing in second language (L2) is challenging and has a complex process as it is considered as the most complicated skill to acquire for English as a foreign language (EFL) learners because in completing a piece of writing, learners must be able to have ability to convert thoughts into writing. To further, [3,4] proposed that to present the ideas into the writing form, it is essential to master the writing organization and linguistic knowledge including grammar and vocabulary. In many EFL settings, the students find problems when they are assigned a written task [5]. Their problems in composing the written task is related to the grammatical errors [6,7], generating their ideas respectively in the writing form [8], and the students are not aware of how to write well using coherence [9]. One way to help the students solve their problem is inform them about their own errors [10]. Giving corrective feedback is claimed an effective way as it allows the teacher to provide corrective feedback widely in order to encourage the students to be aware of their errors [11,12].

Corrective feedback is information provided to the students concerning a linguistic error that they have produced [13]. It has been viewed as a hint to the learner that his use of the target language is incorrect [14]. A. AbuSeileek and A. Abualsha'r, [15] stated that corrective feedback is one of the foremost tools to increase English language learning and teaching with the provision of feedback for the students in order to

correct their errors. In addition, C. V. Beuningen [16] proposed that corrective feedback is a tool that foster language learning which help the students to develop their accuracy since it offers them reflection from their linguistic errors. Finally this paper defines that corrective feedback is information given to the students regarding a linguistic error. This kind of feedback is used to indicate the language errors. The indication of language error helps the students to perform a reflection toward their error. The students' reflection helps them to construct the language error and develop accuracy. Finally, they are able to foster their language learning.

SLA literature reveals some benefits of corrective feedback [i.e.17,18,19,20]. The first benefit relates to the writing grammatical accuracy. There has been a claim that written corrective feedback is an effective learning tool that helps the students to write accurately and effectively as it offers them the grammatical notification that allow them to revise their written work [17]. For example, a study of D. Ahmadi, P. Maftoon, and A. G. Mehrdad [21] revealed that the provision of corrective enables the students to use participle phrases and avoid using resumptive pronouns with significantly greater accuracy. The second benefit of corrective feedback associates with idea organization. T. K. D Pham [18] proposed that providing written corrective feedback for the students helps improve the ability of the students to organize their idea in a writing composition. The third benefit of corrective feedback relates to the use of accurate lexicon. N. M. Diab [19] claimed that corrective feedback is effective tools to help the students manage their incorrect lexicons. The fourth benefit of corrective feedback is related to the students'

awareness. There has been claimed that providing corrective feedback makes the students aware of their error [12]. One example was E. Ebadi's [11] study that found that written corrective feedback (WCF) helped the students to aware their own errors as well as monitor themselves. It also indicated that when the students aware of their error, it lead to fewer error in writing as it helps them to correct and revise their errors.

In the literature of corrective feedback, there are effectively three groups of scholars who grouped corrective feedback which are [22,23,24]. This paper presents the late group as it is the updated framework which offers six types of corrective feedback which are direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, the focus of the feedback, electronic feedback, and reformulation. Of all types of corrective feedback are popular on the study of written corrective feedback currently across the world. However, the scholars in Indonesia are limited to investigate the particular types of written corrective feedback. This paper aims to present an overview of the written corrective feedback (WCF) types, the previous studies as well as its effectiveness. Finally, it describes the teachers' feedback implementation in Indonesian setting.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Types of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)

According to R. Ellis [24], there are six type of written corrective feedback. The overview of these types is presented in the following table.

Table 1: Categories of written corrective feedback [adopted from R. Ellis 24]

Type of corrective feedback	Description
Direct corrective feedback	The correction is provided in a place of incorrect form.
Indirect corrective feedback	The errors are identified and indicated without providing the correct form.
a) Indicating only	a) An error is notified only in the margin or in a line.
b) Indicating the specific location	b) An error is underlined.
Metalinguistic	Metalinguistic clue of an error is provided.
a) Brief grammatical description	a) A brief of grammatical explanation of an error is delivered at the end of text and numbered.
b) Error codes	b) Abbreviation of error codes provided in the margin.
The focus of the feedback	The correction is provided for all errors or specified.
a) Focused	a) The correction given only on specific or targeted features.
b) Unfocused	b) Many or all error correction is addressed.
Electronic feedback	Using a computer to point out the error and provide the example of correct usage.
Reformulation	A native speaker reformulates the

writer's text and maintains the basic content.

1) Direct corrective feedback

The first type of corrective feedback is known as direct corrective feedback. Direct corrective feedback refers to the feedback provided explicitly with the correct form for the students. It indicates that the students make an incorrect form and the correction is provided in a place of the errors. In providing the feedback, the teacher might cross out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, insert a missing word or morpheme as well as provide the correct form above or near to the error form.

R. Ellis [24] argued that direct corrective feedback has a benefit as it offers the learners explicit direction how to revise their errors. It is essential to provide direct corrective feedback when the learners have no idea about the correct form (i.e. are not capable to do self-correction on the error) as it benefits them to produce the correct form when revising their writing. A study related to the advantage of error correction conducted by K. Rustipa [25] showed that direct written corrective feedback assists the students to increase the revision accuracy of an initial piece of writing effectively in the low level of proficiency. Furthermore, a study of Y. Sheen [12] revealed that direct corrective feedback might be effective in promoting acquisition of targeting a single grammatical feature.

2) Indirect Corrective Feedback

The second type of corrective feedback is known as indirect corrective feedback. Indirect corrective feedback refers to the feedback provided implicitly for the students. It indicates that the student makes an incorrect form by providing notification, yet the correct form is not provided. The notification of the incorrect ones is commonly presented by making circled or underlined the errors. It also might be presented by making a note in the margin next to the line without pointing out the exact location of an error. Thus, this type of corrective feedback allows the students to find out their own error and let them to correct it.

The indirect corrective feedback method is often the quickest and easiest way to perform by the teacher. However, it may be inappropriate for students with limited knowledge of linguistics as they might not understand why they produced the errors and they might not know the location of the errors [26]. In addition, the students require the sufficient linguistic knowledge to correct and edit their own errors in the text. This method may strongly demand error correction especially with low level of proficiency learners and most of the teacher spends a lot of time to code the errors [27].

3) *Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback*

The third type of corrective feedback is known as metalinguistic corrective feedback. Metalinguistic corrective feedback refers to the provision of feedback in a form of a linguistic clue or explicit comment on the targeted error(s). It indicates that when the students make an error, they are provided a clue on how to correct the error one. In providing the feedback, the teacher might use the error codes abbreviated labels (e.g. art. means article error). The labels on the different errors are varied and provided at the location of error or in the margin. In addition, the teacher might provide the students a brief description of grammatical errors. Then, the errors are numbered and the metalinguistic explanation of the errors are available at the bottom of the text.

N. M. Diab [19] investigated the effect of corrective feedback on the student's ability to reduce pronoun agreement errors and lexical errors in new essays. The study revealed that metalinguistic feedback may foster knowledge development and increase linguistic accuracy of grammatical structures. This is in line with N. Shintani and E. Ellis's [28] study that revealed that metalinguistic explanation led to gain accuracy in a new piece of writing and helped the learners to develop their L2 explicit knowledge. Additionally, the learners' self-reports also indicated that metalinguistic developed their awareness of the rule and they were able to use it in revising their original text.

4) *Focused and Unfocused Corrective Feedback*

The fourth type of corrective feedback are focused and unfocused corrective feedback. Focused corrective feedback means providing corrective feedback on the targeted errors (e.g. the article errors), while unfocused corrective feedback means providing corrective feedback on all of the errors or a variety of error features on the students' essay. It indicates that both focused and unfocused corrective feedback are not deals with providing the incorrect form or not, instead of what the targeted linguistic features will be focused on. Having the focused corrective feedback makes the learners be able to examine multiple corrections of a single error which lead them to find out the evidence both understanding of why their essay writing was error and they may acquire how to correct them. While unfocused corrective feedback benefits in addressing a range of errors. This type of corrective feedback might not be as effective as focused corrective feedback in helping the students acquire specific features.

L. T. Lam [29] investigated focused and unfocused corrective feedback. The students were grouped into focused written corrective feedback group, unfocused written corrective feedback group, and the control group. The results revealed that both focused and

unfocused groups outperformed the control group. It also indicated that providing focused corrective feedback successfully improved the accurate use of present and past tenses in the students' written texts, both short term and long term. It is obvious that focused corrective feedback method allows the students to notice the specific type of grammatical errors they made.

5) *Electronic Feedback*

The fifth type of corrective feedback is electronic feedback. Electronic feedback is a strategy of providing feedback by using a computer as a tool to point out the written errors [26]. Examples of electronic feedback are providing extensive corpora of written English, either constructed or simply available via search engines such as Google. The feedback can be accessed through software programs when the students write or it can be utilized as a form of feedback.

Electronic feedback helps learners identify and reformulate the errors [15]. In a study of A. AbuSeileek and A. Abualsha'r [15] examined the EFL students' performance in writing provided feedback using computer. The results revealed that track change, computer-mediated corrective feedback, significantly improved the students' overall test score as it might identify the error and reformulate it. In spite of the fact that using computer tools benefit the students, the majority of teachers has limited resources or desire to access computers for their writing and subsequent analysis [26].

6) *Reformulation Feedback*

The sixth type of corrective feedback is reformulation feedback. Reformulation feedback refers to a strategy of correcting an error when a native speaker reconstructs a second language writer's text to make it sounds nativelike as well as maintains the writer's idea as possible. It has been claimed that the native speaker helps the student to rewrite their idea. The main purpose of this strategy is providing the writers the proper linguistic feature that they may be used to correct their errors.

Reformulation feedback helps reduce the error in writing [30]. In her study, A. L. Ibarolla [30] investigated the errors' reduction in the students' draft through a writing-correction-rewriting. The students were grouped into reformulation feedback and self-correction. The result proved that reformulation is better than self-correction concerning error detection. It significantly had a positive effect on error reduction of those errors. In spite of the reformulation correction benefit, the teachers would need extra hours rewriting the entire compositions which is a much demanding task for teachers [26].

Based on the literature and previous studies, it could be seen in general that corrective feedback helps the learners revise their errors in L2 writing. Having direct written corrective feedback benefits the learners to improve their grammatical accuracy in revising their draft as it advantages in reducing and reformulating the errors. In the situation of having the focused corrective feedback, the learners are able to notice the specific type of grammatical errors that they made and it successfully improved the accuracy of grammatical use of the target features in the students written texts, in both short and long term. In the case of metalinguistic corrective feedback, it may foster knowledge development and lead to increase linguistic accuracy of grammatical structures. Providing metalinguistic explanation also helps the learners to develop their L2 explicit knowledge and they become aware of their errors as well as be able to correct them in revising their original text. The combination of written corrective feedback (WCF) types is presented in the following section.

B. Combination of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) Types

Currently many scholars have conducted studies in relation to the corrective feedback types in writing. The study that seems frequently investigated by the scholars is comparison between direct and indirect corrective feedback [such as 25,31,32]. Another type of corrective feedback that has been paid attention is the comparison between focused and unfocused corrective feedback [such as 29,17]. Apart from providing the comparison of one type of corrective feedback, the combination of written corrective feedback types also attracts the scholar interest. For example, direct focused corrective feedback [33], direct metalinguistic corrective feedback [12,19], and focused metalinguistic corrective feedback [11]. The first combination of corrective feedback that has been investigated was direct focused corrective feedback. Direct focused corrective feedback refers to providing corrective feedback directly at the location of the error with targeted the particular linguistic features. Direct focused corrective feedback improves the students' mastery of particular linguistic features. F. Farrokhi and S. Sattarpour [33] investigated the different types of written corrective feedback on the accurate use of grammatical forms. Sixty participants were divided into direct focused corrective feedback group, direct unfocused corrective feedback group, and a control group. In the direct focused group, the feedback provided directly on the targeted errors (i.e. the indefinite and the indefinite article). In the direct unfocused corrective feedback, the feedback provided directly at five grammatical features including the English article, copula 'be', regular and irregular past tense, third person 's', and prepositions (e.g., at, in,

on). While no feedback on the control group. The result of the study found that both experimental group, direct focused and direct unfocused showed better accuracy performances on the posttest than the control group. In addition, the direct focused group outperformed the direct unfocused group. Finally, providing direct focused feedback enhanced the students to mastery the linguistic features particularly in the accurate use of English articles in a piece of writing.

The second combination that has been investigated was direct metalinguistic corrective feedback. Direct metalinguistic corrective feedback refers to an indication of an error location and the provision of the metalinguistic comment, either error codes or brief grammatical description that explain the correct form. The combination of direct metalinguistic corrective feedback assist the students to aware of the grammatical rules and improve the grammatical accuracy in writing.

The first example of study was conducted by Y. Sheen [12]. This study investigated the effect of written corrective feedback on intermediate ESL learners' acquisition of English articles. 111 participants were divided into direct group, direct metalinguistic group, and a control group. The first group was provided an error correction that indicates an error location on the students' writing as well as a provision of the correct form in which it either deleted, replaced, or added a linguistic element. The second group was provided correction by an indication of an error location, provision of the correct form and metalinguistic clue which describes explanation regarding the correct form. While no feedback on the control group. The findings indicated that both experimental groups were superior to the control group. However, direct metalinguistic corrective feedback was superior to direct corrective feedback only. The results also indicated that direct metalinguistic corrective feedback proved to be effective in enhancing the students' accuracy. Direct corrective feedback seems to promote awareness as noticing, while direct metalinguistic corrective feedback promotes awareness as understanding. It could be noticed that direct metalinguistic corrective feedback offers a greater level of awareness which simplify learning and it has a superior capacity to take part in language analysis.

The second example study of direct metalinguistic corrective feedback was conducted by N. M. Diab [19]. This study investigated the written corrective feedback effect on the students' ability in order to decrease pronoun agreement errors and wrong word in new essays. Fifty-seven participants were divided into direct metalinguistic corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, and the control group. The students on the direct metalinguistic group

received error codes (i.e. “Pr.Agr” for pronoun agreement error and “W.W” for a wrong word) and the teacher also provided the reason why a certain pronoun agreement and lexical terms were considered wrong. The students on the metalinguistic corrective feedback group only received error codes. While no feedback provided on the control group. The result of study found that every group decreased the number of pronoun agreement errors (Pr. Agr.) and wrong word (W.W) at the immediate posttest. In addition, the students who provided direct metalinguistic corrective feedback significantly decreased their grammatical errors (Pr. Agr.). This study revealed that the combination between direct metalinguistic corrective feedback had a greater benefit concerning the students’ language errors. It is also indicated that focusing on the targeted linguistic features helped the students to acquire them.

The third combination that has been investigated was focused metalinguistic corrective feedback. Focused metalinguistic corrective feedback is defined as the provision of the correction directly at the targeted linguistic feature as well as the provision of metalinguistic explanation (the grammatical rules and the example). The combination of focused metalinguistic corrective feedback benefits the students to learn the English grammatical rules on the particular features and aware of their errors in writing. E. Ebadi [11] investigated the focused metalinguistic corrective feedback effect on EFL students’ writing ability. Forty-seven participants were assigned into focused metalinguistic WCF group, and a control group. The participants on the focused metalinguistic WCF group were provided correction directly at the selected linguistic feature as well as the provision of brief metalinguistic explanation was described (i.e. the provision of grammatical rules as well the example), while the participants on the control group provided feedback using traditional method. The result of the study found that focused metalinguistic corrective feedback was superior to the control group in improving Iranian EFL learners writing ability. It is suggested that employing focused metalinguistic feedback led to a significantly fewer errors in writing and assisted the students being aware of their own errors and monitor themselves. Finally, it is indicated that having focused metalinguistic corrective feedback helped the students to acquire English grammar rules from the error that they produced, they became aware of their errors through the comment, and they were able to reduce and correct their own errors.

C. Teachers’ Feedback in Indonesia

Recently, a number of scholars have conducted studies on written corrective feedback in Indonesia. There has been a lot of studies investigating direct and indirect corrective feedback as it attack the scholar

interest. Those studies investigated the writing accuracy (i.e. the use of accurate grammar), and the writing performance (i.e. idea organization and writing mechanism). The students’ writing accuracy and writing performance improved after receiving direct and indirect corrective feedback. However, direct corrective feedback outperformed indirect corrective feedback in Indonesian context.

The first example of study relates to the writing accuracy. K. Rustipa [34] investigated the direct and indirect written corrective feedback effect on the EFL learners’ writing. Thirty students were grouped randomly into direct and indirect feedback group. For the direct feedback group, the correct form and the missing words were provided by the teacher. While for the indirect feedback group, the teacher feedback involved underlined and inserted the codes of the absent and/or the mistaken word. The finding revealed that direct and indirect corrective feedback has potential to increase EFL students’ writing. It is also indicated that direct corrective feedback is significantly effective in increasing the students’ accuracy in composing a Hortatory Exposition text.

The second example also relates to the writing accuracy. F. Farrokhi and S. Sattarpour [35] investigated the direct and indirect written corrective feedback effect on the students’ L2 writing accuracy. Forty-three freshman and sophomore Indonesian students were randomly assigned into two groups; direct WCF group and indirect WCF group. In checking the students’ texts in the direct WCF group, the teacher circled or underlined or crossed out the errors as well as provided the correct form under the errors. While in the indirect WCF group, the teacher only marked the errors without providing the correct form instead of providing a correcting symbol under each error. The findings revealed that the students’ writing accuracy receiving direct WCF significantly improved while those receiving indirect WCF treatment was not. It is indicated that direct WCF has more significant improvement on the students’ writing accuracy.

The third example of study related to the writing performance. T. D. Wijayatiningsih [9] examined the corrective feedback effect on the students’ writing performance. The fourth year students majoring in English Department at a University in Indonesia were involved in this study. They were divided into direct and indirect corrective feedback. The result of the study found that direct corrective feedback is beneficial for improving the students’ writing performance.

The fourth example of study also related to the writing performance. P. Tursina and M. Chuang [36] examined the direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL students’ writing performance. Sixty college students were assigned into four groups; direct

corrective feedback with low proficiency writers, indirect corrective feedback with low proficiency writers, direct corrective feedback with high proficiency writers, and indirect corrective feedback with high proficiency writers. The results of the study revealed that all groups significantly improved their writing performance. However, it also indicated that both low and high proficiency writers received direct corrective feedback outperformed those who received indirect corrective feedback.

It could be seen that the investigations on the written corrective feedback in Indonesia are limited to

III. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the literature of all types of the corrective feedback and the previous studies across the world, the present paper highlights the effectiveness of a single type of written corrective feedback which are direct, focused, and metalinguistic corrective feedback. SLA literature has revealed that when comparing direct and indirect corrective feedback, the direct corrective feedback outperformed the indirect corrective feedback. It is also revealed that direct corrective feedback as an effective tool that helps the low level of English learners' proficiency in revising their essays [34]. When comparing focused and unfocused corrective feedback, the focused corrective feedback is superior to unfocused corrective feedback. It has been claimed that focused corrective feedback is an effective method to promote the students' grammatical accuracy [17,12]. In addition, SLA literature further states that metalinguistic corrective feedback makes the students aware of their errors which in turn helps them correct and revise their errors [12].

In the term of combining types of WCF, it is found that some advantages. The first, when direct and focused corrective feedback are combined, it resulted the students' mastery on the particular linguistic

the comparison of direct and indirect corrective feedback. Those have been done in the tertiary level in higher education. It is clear that most of the result of the study revealed that direct and indirect corrective feedback improved EFL writing accuracy and performance. It is also indicated that direct corrective feedback was superior to indirect corrective feedback. However, there are some other types of corrective feedback that might be implemented to provide corrective feedback for the students in Indonesian setting.

features in a piece of writing [33]. The second, direct metalinguistic corrective feedback is effective method to promote the students' awareness and the grammatical accuracy [19,12]. The third, focused metalinguistic corrective helped the students to acquire English grammar rules from the error, they also became aware of their error errors, and finally they were able to reduce and correct their own errors [11].

In Indonesian setting, most of the teacher implement a single type of written corrective feedback which are direct and indirect corrective feedback. Those types of corrective feedback offer effectiveness. However, combining types of written corrective feedback seems to have more advantages (i.e. direct focused corrective feedback, direct metalinguistic corrective feedback, and focused metalinguistic corrective feedback). Those combinations valued to enhance the students writing ability across the world. Hence, this paper proposes that providing the combination of direct metalinguistic corrective feedback with focusing on the targeted errors is effective method to enhance the students' writing accuracy, to help them acquire grammatical rules of targeted linguistic features, and to make them aware of their errors in which turn to help them in revising their writing.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Harmer, *How to Teach Writing*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Ltd, 2004.
- [2] D. Nunan, *Practical English Language Teaching*. Singapore: McGraw Hill, 2003.
- [3] C. Coffin, "Theoretical approaches to writing language-A TESOL perspective. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.)," *Analysing English in a global context*, London: Routledge, pp. 93-122, 2001.
- [4] K. Hyland, *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [5] S. Lee, "Facilitating and inhibiting factors in English as a foreign language writing performance: A model testing with structural equation," *Journal of Language Learning*, vol. 52 (2), pp. 335-374, 2005.
- [6] M. Basri D and A. T. Ampa, "Syntactic errors in descriptive paragraphs by native Indonesian speaking students of English," *International Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 5 (5), pp. 125-137, 2013.
- [7] J. J. Mardijono, "Indonesian EFL Advanced Learners' Grammatical Errors," *K@ta*, vol. 5(1), pp. 67-90, 2003.
- [8] M. Wihadi and I. Martiana, "The effect of teacher's written feedbacks on Indonesian EFL learners' recount writing competence," *Indonesian EFL Journal*, vol. 1 (1), pp. 63- 68, 2015.
- [9] T. D. Wijayatiningsih, "Direct corrective feedback on students' writing performance," *4th ELTLT International Conference Proceedings*, pp. 873-880, 2015.

- [10] N. Paris, S. Ngonkum, and P. Deerajviset, "Teacher's feedback in Indonesian's English writing," *Proceedings: The 63rd TEFLIN International Conference*, pp. 683-691, 2016.
- [11] E. Ebadi, "The effect of focused meta-linguistic written corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' essay writing ability," *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 5 (4), pp. 878-883, 2014.
- [12] Y. Sheen, "The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles," *Tesol Quarterly*, vol. 41 (2), pp. 255-283, 2007.
- [13] S. Loewen, "The role of feedback. In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.)," *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 24-40, 2012.
- [14] M. P. Lightbown and N. Spada, *How Languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1993.
- [15] A. AbuSeileek and A. Abualsha'r, "Using peer computer-mediated corrective feedback to support EFL learners' writing," *Language Learning & Technology*, vol. 18 (1), pp. 76-95, 2014.
- [16] C. V. Beuningen, "Corrective feedback in L2 writing: theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions," *International Journal of English Studies*, vol. 10 (2), pp. 1-27, 2010.
- [17] Y. Sheen, D. Wright, and A. Moldawa, "Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners," *System*, vol. 37, pp. 556-569, 2009.
- [18] T. K. D. Pham, "Different forms of corrective feedback and their effects on L2 Students' writing accuracy: a case study," *Asian Journal of Education Research*, vol. 3 (1), pp. 10-17, 2015.
- [19] N. M. Diab, "Effectiveness of written corrective feedback: does type of error and type of correction matter?," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 24, pp. 16-34, 2015.
- [20] J. Bitchener and U. Knoch, "The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students," *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 12 (3), pp. 409-431, 2008.
- [21] D. Ahmadi, P. Maftoon, and A. G. Mehrdad, "Investigating the effects of two types of feedback on EFL student's writing," *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 46, pp. 2590-2595, 2012.
- [22] R. Lyster and L. Ranta, "Corrective feedback and learner uptake," *SSLA*, vol. 20, pp. 37-66, 1997.
- [23] J. Bitchener, S. Young, and D. Cameron, "The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 14, pp. 191-205, 2005.
- [24] R. Ellis, "A typology of written corrective feedback types," *ELT Journal*, vol. 62 (2), pp. 97-107, 2007.
- [25] K. Rustipa, "The Benefit of Indirect Comprehensive Error Corrections in Improving Advanced EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy," *Proceedings: The 2nd International Language and Language Teaching Conference*, pp. 551-557, 2015.
- [26] Pariyanto, "The effect of corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy in the writing of EFL university students," [Doctoral Dissertation in English Language Teaching]. Malang: State University of Malang, 2017, "Unpublished".
- [27] E. Eslami, "The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing," *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 98, pp. 445-452, 2014.
- [28] N. Shintani and E. Ellis, "The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 22, pp. 286-306, 2013.
- [29] L. T. Lam, "The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on the accurate use of tenses in Hong Kong primary ESL context," Hongkong: The Education University of Hongkong Library Press, 2016, "Unpublished".
- [30] A. L. Ibarolla, "Reformulation and self-correction: insights into correction strategies for EFL writing in a school context," *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, pp. 29-49, 2013.
- [31] H. Hashemnezhad and S. Mohammadnejad, "A case for direct and indirect feedback: the other side of coin," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 5 (3), pp. 230-239, 2012.
- [32] C. G. V. Beuningen, N. H. D. Jong, and F. Kuiken, "The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy," *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 156, pp. 279-29, 2008.
- [33] F. Farrokhi and S. Sattarpour, "The effects of direct written corrective feedback on improvement of grammatical accuracy of high-proficient L2 learners," *World Journal of Education*, vol. 2 (2), pp. 49-57, 2012.
- [34] K. Rustipa, "The effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving EFL learners' hortatory exposition writing," *Proceedings: The 61st TEFLIN International Conference*, pp. 625-628, 2014.
- [35] Y. P. Kisananto, "The effect of written corrective feedback on higher education students' writing accuracy," *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, vol. 16 (2), pp. 121-131, 2016.

- [36] P. Tursina and M. Chuang, "Direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL students' writing performance," Proceedings of the 1st English Education International Conference (EEIC) in conjunction with the 2nd Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium (RGRS) of the Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities (CAPEU), pp. 209-214, 2016.